

## REMARKS

Through the above amendment, Applicant more precisely recites the present invention as a metal structure (e.g. a metal curing fixture) comprising a steel surface having deposited thereon a mixture defined in accord with the disclosure thereof in the specification. Support for this subject matter is found, for example, in the specification at page 2, lines 17-23 where an object of the present invention is to provide a metal surface that has deposited thereon a mixture of a polymer particulate and a powder adhesive which thereafter is cured to adhere the particulate on the surface as an acid-impervious coating. Thus, the mixture is described and likewise claimed as deposited on a metal (not a coated metal) surface, and so there retained by a powder adhesive which is adhesively operational only upon curing and is so cured after (not *before*) deposition of the mixture on the metal (steel) surface.

In the Office Action dated March 28, 2001, a final rejection of all claims present in the application, those claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)/102(b) as being anticipated, respectively, by Tanaka et al. or Merval et al.

With respect to Tanaka et al., the Office Action found that the then-recited claims did not preclude the use of a surface-treated steel surface that could include a zinc or zinc-alloy plated steel plate as disclosed by Tanaka et al. The above claims

of the instant amendment recite a steel surface (not a *coated*-steel surface) having deposited thereon a mixture of an acid-impervious polymer particulate and a powder adhesive. Since Tanaka et al. teach only a *coated*-steel surface, it is Applicant's belief that Tanaka et al. do not anticipate or suggest or make obvious the deposition of an acid-impervious polymer particulate and a powder adhesive on a non-coated steel surface.

With respect to Merval et al, the Merval et al. adhesive component is not a powder adhesive mixed with a coating product and cured after being applied, but, instead, is a *pre-produced* adhesive not cured in place and therefore believed *not* to gain inherently intimate adhesive properties through inter-association with applied particulate. Conversely, the instantly claimed powder adhesive is *mixed* with particulate, has no adhesion property prior to curing, and is so cured *after* deposition in its particulate/adhesive mixture-state on the steel surface to then provide adherence for the accompanying particulate. Since it is believed that Merval et al. cannot provide this intimate inter-association of adhesive and particulate with a *pre-produced* adhesive, it is Applicant's corresponding belief that Merval et al. do not anticipate or suggest or make obvious the deposition of a mixture of an acid-impervious polymer particulate and a subsequently cured-in-place powder adhesive on an initially non-coated steel surface to provide the resultant instantly claimed metal structure.



In view of the above amendment and discussion, it is Applicant's belief that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: 6/26/01

By: Bruce B. Brunda  
Bruce B. Brunda  
Registration No. 28,497  
STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER  
75 Enterprise, Suite 250  
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656-2626  
(949) 855-1246

TCN:cal

C:\AMEND\NORTH358GQ.amd.wpd

RECEIVED  
JUL -2 2001  
TC 1700 MAIL ROOM